

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD  
6 March 2013**

**The Mayor – Councillor George Simons**

**Present:**

Councillors Arculus, Ash, Casey, Cereste, Dalton, Davidson, Day, Eley, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Forbes, Fower, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Maqbool, Martin, McKean, Miners, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Sylvester, Thacker, Thulbourn, Todd and Walsh.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Allen.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

The Mayor advised that the Audit Committee had previously granted a dispensation for all Members, should they have a disclosable interest, which enabled them to debate and vote on the budget item later in the agenda.

Councillor Miners advised that he had a pecuniary interest as a family member was employed by Spurgeons.

Councillor Murphy declared a pecuniary interest as he was employed by Gladstone Connect.

Councillor Cereste declared that a housing company that he was associated with had a Service Level Agreement with the Council.

Councillor Judy Fox advised that she had an interest due to her involvement with Sure Start Play Area at Welbourn School.

Councillor John Fox advised that he had an interest due to his involvement with Sure Start Play Area at Welbourn School.

**3. Minutes of the Meetings Held on 30 January 2013**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2013 were agreed and signed as an accurate record.

**4. Mayors Announcement Report**

Members noted the updated report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period 31 January 2013 to 3 March 2013.

The Mayor addressed the meeting and requested that Members work together for the good of the city and were polite and respectful in debate.

## 5. Leader's Announcements

The Leader drew Members attention to a new leaflet that had been distributed for the 'Discover Peterborough' campaign to attract visitors to the city.

## 6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

## COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME

### 7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

Twelve questions had been raised by members of the public, these were in relation to:

1. The removal of solar farms from a Neighbourhood Committee agenda;
2. Working with communities to help retain play services;
3. Confidence in the financial arrangements for the solar farms;

When the ten minutes allocated for this item had been reached Councillor Swift moved that a further 20 minutes be given to allow all members of public the opportunity to be heard. This was seconded by Councillor Fox. A brief debate was held where Members raised concern at the length of time allowed for receipt of questions from members of the public.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting for 15 minutes to allow advice to be given to members of the public on the council's rules of procedure concerning the submission of questions and petitions.

The meeting reconvened and the motion put forward by Councillor Swift to extend the time allowed for the item by 20 minutes was **AGREED**. The remaining questions relating to the following subjects were taken as read:

4. Financial Support for community groups to run play services;
5. Request community groups to run play services;
6. Establish a charity to run play services;
7. Reduction in play services impact on social care budgets;
8. Support for voluntary sector to assist adult social care;
9. Resources for preventative offer;
10. Request letter re solar farms;
11. Support for 5-12 year olds if no play service;
12. More solar panels on buildings.

A summary of the question and answers raised within agenda item 7 is attached at **Appendix A** to these minutes.

### 8. Questions with Notice by Members of the Council Relating to Ward Matters to the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen

Questions relating to Ward matters were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Funding for Staniland Way roundabout;
2. Increase in parking enforcement officers;
3. Costs arising from Freemans building solar panels; and
4. Parking on grasscrete verges.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 8 are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

**9. Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Fire Authority**

There were no questions received for the Council's representatives of the Fire Authority. The Solicitor to the Council advised that the mechanism to submit questions from Council to the Commissioner was still being determined.

**10. Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive**

Questions to the Leader and Members of the Executive were raised in respect of the following:

1. Rent arrears and payments from Peterborough United;
2. Long Causeway improvements;

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 10 are attached at **APPENDIX B** to these minutes.

**11. Petitions Submitted by Members or Residents**

Alan Clark and Rachel Cousins submitted a petition to keep Thistle Drive Play Centre open and calling on the City Council to stop the cuts to local play services and re-open for all 8-14 year olds 5 days a week.

Kerrie Gracie submitted a petition to stop the cuts to local play services and re-open play centres to all 5-14 year olds for 5 days per week.

Nicola Day submitted a petition to keep Paston Farm Play Centre open and stop the cuts to local play services and re-open play centres to all 5-14 year olds for 5 days per week.

Amanda Preston on behalf of adults with learning disabilities submitted a petition against all the proposals to save money at the expense of disabled, elderly and vulnerable people.

Councillor Sandford submitted a petition urging the Leader and Cabinet to reconsider the proposed cuts in basic services such as play centres, public transport, library opening hours and social care and to prioritise services to the public over expensive grandiose projects and to amend their budget proposals accordingly.

Councillor Martin submitted a petition opposing reductions to the opening hours of Bretton library.

**EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME**

**12. Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions**

Members received and noted a report summarising:

1. Decisions taken at the Cabinet Meetings held on 4 February 2013 and 25 February 2013;
2. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the meeting;
3. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting; and
4. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 28 January 2013 to 26 February 2013.

## **Questions were asked about the following:**

### Transfer of Public Health

Councillor Miners queried whether services for young and older residents were being included. Councillor Cereste confirmed that all Public Health services were included.

### Review of Charging Policy and Eligibility Criteria for Adult Social Care Services

Councillor John Fox queried how £350,000 was predicted to be saved in the coming financial year but £500,000 savings in future years when the changes had not yet been rolled out and numbers of those affected were not yet known. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that although some savings may change, no-one would be put at risk.

Councillor Khan queried what risk assessment had been carried out as a result of people potentially no longer qualifying for the services they currently received and the planned cost rises and how these people would be supported. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that a detailed response could be provided but in summary risk assessments were undertaken and that there were a range of charges that could apply.

Councillor Murphy queried whether an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) had been carried out; whether the backlog of assessments would be based on the new criteria if conducted after April; and whether the Cabinet Member was aware that the charity Mencap had indicated that Peterborough was to implement different assessment criteria than some other Local Authorities. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that an EIA had been carried out; some service users may see their care level raised following assessment and the backlog would be cleared by April and the new criteria come into force; and that many councils had already, like Peterborough, revised their assessment criteria to enable the limited funding to be directed at the most vulnerable.

Councillor Sharp queried whether the use of voluntary organisations to provide support was effectively outsourcing the service provision. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the Council had a statutory duty to provide care and support for a range of vulnerable people.

Councillor John Fox queried whether more money could be directed to the disability information advice service. Councillor Fitzgerald said that along with greater 'online' support the information advice service could also be considered for greater use.

### Children's Services Update

Councillor Shearman queried whether there was a result available from the recent Ofsted inspection. Councillor Scott responded by saying that the results from the most recent inspection would be available and published in the next few days.

### Establishment of a Local Transport Body and Draft Assurance Framework

Councillor Ash queried how the Board would be accountable to Peterborough residents and councillors and what influence Peterborough would have if Cambridgeshire County Council was the accountable body. Councillor Hiller assured Councillor Ash that Peterborough City Council would be represented and would have voting rights in the organisation.

Councillor Sandford queried whether the meetings would be held in public. Councillor Hiller advised that the shadow body does meet in public.

### Community Cohesion Action Plan 2012/13 – award of grants to not for profit organisations

Councillor Shearman queried whether funding would continue for 2013/14. Councillor Walsh advised that work was under way to access funding for the 2013/14 year.

### Locally Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education

Councillor Sherman commended the syllabus's recognition of the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic make up of the city.

## 13. Executive Recommendations

### (a) Housing Allocations Policy

Cabinet at its meeting of 25 February 2013 received a report updating it on the proposed review of the Common Allocations Policy and requesting it agreed the final draft to be taken to full council for adoption.

Councillor Hiller, the Cabinet Member for Housing Neighbourhoods and Planning, provided an overview of the proposals and moved the recommendation that Council adopt the Common Housing Register Allocation Policy. This was seconded by Councillor Serluca, who reserved her right to speak.

Members debated the recommendation and raised points including:

- Concern for existing tenants' housing options if reassessed;
- If forced to move to private rental it could become unaffordable for many families;
- The less well regulated private sector was not as safe for vulnerable families;
- Improvements needed to the private sector first;
- More housing needed for more families;
- Must define assessment criteria accurately e.g. what is 'hardship';

Councillor Hiller replied, advising that the landlord accreditation scheme was being developed for private sector landlords and that with over 9,000 applicants on the housing list action must be taken to manage this.

A vote was taken (31 for, 1 against, 18 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council adopts the Common Housing Register Allocations Policy.

The meeting adjourned for 15 minutes.

### (b) Budget 2013/14 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to 2022/23

Cabinet, at its meeting of 25 February 2013, received a report presenting budget proposals for 2013/14 through to 2022/23, in line with the provisional local government finance settlement for 2013/14 and in advance of some Department for Education specific grants being announced. The report contained three key sections:

- Cabinet report and summary of council funding implications, including proposals on council tax;
- The draft MTFS, including capital strategy, asset management plan and Treasury Strategy;
- The budget consultation document being used for scrutiny, stakeholder and public consultation updated for any changes.

In addition, the report also had regard to the revised budget timetable approved by Full Council at the meeting of 10 October under the council constitution Part 4, Section 6 – Budget and Policy Framework Rules.

Councillor Seaton, the Cabinet Member for Resources, introduced the Budget for 2013/14 and accompanying MTFS 2022/23, moving the recommendations detailed in the Budget Book together with an additional addendum that included and update to the consultation responses, an amended narrative to the sick pay proposals and clarification on the occupancy periods for council tax discount changes.

The Cabinet Member for Resources thanked everyone who had contributed to the development of the budget proposals and highlighted that £17million needed to be saved, amendments to services were required to achieve this saving, council tax would be frozen, there would be continued support for the most vulnerable, there would be continued efforts to attract businesses to the city and the budget would ensure educational development was maintained. These proposals were seconded by Councillor Cereste who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

During debate on the budget proposals, points raised in favour included:

- No alternative budget or amendments were submitted against the proposals;
- Limited funds from government to provide all services;
- Your Peterborough magazine was useful for many residents;
- Libraries are remaining open;
- Communities could deliver play services with Council support;
- £45million was being provided for Adult Social Care;
- Continued investment in school improvement and school place provision;
- City Centre development was needed to attract businesses and growth throughout the city;
- Over 4,000 jobs were created in the previous year;
- Many solar power generation projects already working well to provide an income for the council; and
- Continued house building was needed for future growth and income.

During debate on the budget proposals, points raised against included:

- Cuts to adult social care and play centre funding will be detrimental to many vulnerable residents;
- Play Services enabled other service provision such as intervention and family support;
- Volunteers would not be able to run the play services and buildings and voluntary sector grants are being cut;
- Free play services are maintained by many other Authorities;
- Amendments to Adult Social Care criteria not required until 2015 so should be delayed;
- Funding should not be reduced for libraries;
- Should remove funding allocation for Your Peterborough magazine;
- Should remove funding for the steam locomotive;
- Should not increase CCTV coverage as not enough operators for current system;
- Should have increased council tax to safeguard future income;
- Should not prioritise city centre development above other areas of the city;
- Community Leadership Fund monies valuable to local groups;
- Cuts to public transport not in line with Environment Capital aspirations and will affect most disadvantaged residents;
- Priority seems to be the city centre and solar farms, not the most vulnerable and disadvantaged;
- Should not increase Enterprise funding from contracted amount;
- Need manufacturing strategy, not just retail and distribution;
- Too much borrowing and risk for projects; and
- Other Authorities have invested heavily in public transport.

During the above debate Councillor Holdich moved a motion to extend the guillotine for the meeting by 15 minutes. This was seconded by Councillor Lee and following a vote (31 for, 21 against) it was **AGREED** to extend the guillotine by 15 minutes.

When the guillotine for the meeting was reached and in accordance with the council's rules of procedure the meeting moved immediately to vote on the proposals put forward by Councillor Seaton. A recorded vote was requested and agreed. Members voted as follows:

Councillors for: Arculus, Casey, Cereste, Dalton, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Kreling, Lamb, Lee, Maqbool, McKean, Nadeem, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Stokes, Todd and Walsh.

Councillor against: Ash, Davidson, Fletcher, Forbes, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harrington, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Lane, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester and Thulbourn.

Councillor not voting: Thacker

Following the vote (29 in favour, 25 against and 1 abstention) it was **RESOLVED** to approve the recommendations for the budget for 2013/14 and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to 2022/23 as below:

- a) The revenue budget for 2013/14 and the medium term financial strategy to 2022/23, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy;
- b) The capital programme for 2013/14 to 2022/23 and related strategies and indicators;
- c) The council tax freeze in 2013/14 and indicative increases for planning purposes of 2.00% for 2014/15 to 2022/23;
- d) The council tax setting resolution as set out in appendix A;
- e) The setting of fees and charges for 2013/14 including indicative fee and charges increase for 2014/15 and 2015/16;
- f) The reserves position; and
- g) Deferral of mandatory implementation of auto enrolment of pensions for employees until 30 September 2017.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **14. Changes to the Constitution Required as a Result of the Transfer of Public Health Responsibilities to the Council Under the Health and Social Care Act 2013 with effect from 1 April 2013.**

The guillotine for the meeting had been reached and therefore in accordance with the council's rules of procedure the above report was deemed to be formally moved and seconded.

It was **AGREED** to approve the recommendations in the report as below:

- 1) Council notes that the responsibility for Public Health is to be moved from the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care at part 3, section 3, para 3.10 (d) into the Leader's personal portfolio at para 3.4;
- 2) Council notes the delegations from the Leader to the Director of Public Health, as shown in the attached Appendix 1, to be included in the Constitution; and
- 3) Council approves the Standing Orders and Rules of Procedure in relation to the Health & Wellbeing Board as shown in the attached Appendix 2, to be included in the Constitution.

The Mayor  
19.00 – 23.45

## FULL COUNCIL 6 MARCH 2013

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUMMARY

Questions have been received under the following categories:

<b><u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME</u></b>	
<b>7</b>	<b><u>Questions with notice by members of the public</u></b>
1.	<p><b>Question from Dawn Clipston</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:</p> <p>Can you please tell me why the Energy Park proposal was removed from the agenda of the North West 1 Rural Neighbourhood Committee agenda in December 2012 held at Eye School?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>At an earlier Neighbourhood Committee meeting, the community had requested that the Energy Park proposal be an item on a future agenda. This was subsequently agreed with the project team. When the agenda was being drafted for the Committee meeting of the 12 December 2012, the project team were invited to attend, and had to decline for a two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team were already committed to attend a pre-arranged meeting with members of the Newborough Landscape Protection Group; and</li> <li>• The planning applications had not yet been submitted and it was felt that discussions would be more useful once the applications had been made</li> </ul> <p>It was therefore agreed that the project team would attend a future Committee meeting dedicated to the Energy Park proposals. Due to the consultation around the future of Neighbourhood Committees this additional meeting is still to be arranged.</p> <p><b>Dawn Clipston asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>To keep publicly stating that you are consulting with the public but not doing so loses public confidence in your leadership; how do you feel about this?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>I don't agree with the statement.</p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Nicola Day</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</p> <p>The medium term financial plan identified cuts to the play service in 2010. We have seen the service underinvested for two years now, putting it at the brink of not being able to open. Why in the last two years has the council not worked with communities to find ways to provide sustainable, maintain &amp; develop play services? Why have you waited until the last hour?</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>The budget from government has only recently been announced which included a reduction in the early intervention grant with ring fenced funding for other services and therefore no firm plan had been in place until only earlier this year. Subject to the budget agreement later in the meeting, we will be working with local communities to find out if they are interested in utilising the play centre buildings. It will be up to them what type of services would be delivered from these if they chose to take the buildings on.</p> <p><b>Nicola Day asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Why have other costly projects and ventures such as an Energy Park and football stadium been continued instead of focussing resources on providing services for the people of Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>I don't agree that this has happened. We must continue to focus the limited resources that we have on safeguarding and targeting those children who are most in need.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Alex Terry</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, you have said the council needs profits from the proposed solar farms to guarantee essential services in future budgets. It is also on record that the financial plans and projected profits have been endorsed by experts so the people of Peterborough needn't worry about any financial risk. However, as a prudent householder I hate spending beyond my means and it worries me to see the council prepared to accept so much debt. Are you confident that the advice from these experts is reliable enough to justify the council incurring significant debts in this year's budget?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question. I am confident that our numbers are correct and that not only will we be able to service the debt, but that we will also make a significant income over many years for the benefit of everyone in this city. The energy park is expected to generate £110 million profit over its lifetime which will enable the council to continue providing services for its residents should planning permission be granted. If the project was not to go ahead, council tax rates would have to raise by 9-10% each year to ensure services can continue for everyone in the city.</p> <p><b>Alex Terry asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Along with the PFI arrangement at the Hospital and the failed Freemans solar installation, how would you describe the council that allows another costly project befall upon this city that creates financial uncertainty and ruins a beautiful area of the city?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>The Freemans building installation has so far cost £300,000 and has not worked so far but we are working with the contractors and will put that right without incurring further costs to the allocated project budget of around £1million in total. There are many solar installations that are already up and running across the city as planned. The PFI arrangement at the Hospital and the costs involved was not my, nor the Council's, responsibility. The arrangement was approved by the Strategic Health Authority and</p>

	<p>when I was previously chairman of the Primary Care Trust I did all I could to assist the Hospital's financial situation but was not responsible for it and was never a member of the hospital trust.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Kevin Bell</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</p> <p>Residents and community associations serve the needs of their communities but often struggle for funds. What financial support will the council give community groups over the next 12 months and beyond to take on these play centre buildings?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>We are unable to provide any financial support directly. However, we will support community associations and other groups if they wish to access any grant funding that might be available.</p> <p><b>Kevin Bell asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>How can the voluntary sector maintain the buildings if there will be no funding to do so?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>Work has already begun through the Neighbourhoods teams to achieve this and have already contacted an organisation to help raise funding.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Andrew Palmer</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</p> <p>Would the council consider instructing the community groups who will be running the play buildings in the future to support the development of provision for 5-12 play as part of the building transfer agreements?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>It has not been agreed that community groups will be running the play buildings. We are working with local communities to see if they would be interested in taking on the running of the buildings. This will mean that they have to generate an income to do this. We could not instruct groups to deliver play.</p> <p><b>There was no supplementary question.</b></p>
6.	<p><b>Question from Bonita Yonga (absent)</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</p> <p>Would the cabinet member consider supporting the development of a sustainable play charity like New Ark Play Centre to run the play service as this supports the commissioning of early intervention and prevention for children and has this already been discussed?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>No provider, including New Ark, could run a free of charge play service. We are talking</p>

	<p>to local communities about what they would want to see delivered from play centre buildings. We will support local communities who are interested in developing provision in the buildings, but we cannot directly assist them financially.</p> <p><b>There was no supplementary question.</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Terrie Gracie</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services:</p> <p>Play services have changed a lot in the last 18 months to support social care. Play services work to support primary schools and those children not in mainstream education. In light of Peterborough's need to keep improving Children's Services and develop early intervention and prevention is this the right time to be cutting play services that contribute to keeping children out of social care?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>We are commissioning and delivering a range of services to prevent families needing to access Children’s Social Care. This year the Government has funded the ‘Connecting Families Programme’ in Peterborough and the NSPCC are delivering parenting programmes. Supporting the development of parenting skills is the most effective way of preventing referrals to children’s social care.</p> <p><b>There was no supplementary question.</b></p>
8.	<p><b>Question from Amanda Preston</b></p> <p>To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care:</p> <p>What provision does the Council propose to make to create the capacity in the voluntary sector to fill the gap left by the loss of adult social care to people whose needs have been assessed as “High Moderate”?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</b></p> <p>The change to our eligibility criteria for adult social care brings Peterborough in line with 86% of other councils up and down the country who only provide funded social care to those with critical and substantial levels of needs.</p> <p>In implementing these changes we will ensure that people with moderate levels of needs will still have access to reablement – designed to assist people to regain confidence and skills in managing their lives and therefore to be able to manage independently.</p> <p>For people with life long conditions including learning disabilities, we will be ensuring that those assessed as having moderate needs are provided with longer term transitional support to assist them with managing their own lives.</p> <p>Our on-line care directory which is being launched this month will also be available to assist people who do not qualify for council-funded support to gain access to an increasing range of providers, many in the voluntary and charitable sector who can provide support.</p> <p><b>Amanda Preston asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Will the council be providing more funding to increase capacity in the voluntary sector or</p>

	<p>will the council stop advising vulnerable people that the voluntary sector can pick up more cases and provide support?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</b></p> <p>As stated in the recent Cabinet report, more support will be put in place for those with moderate long term needs.</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Amanda Preston</b></p> <p>To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care:</p> <p>Following the recent Cabinet Decision on changes to eligibility and charging for adult social care services, how much money is to be allocated to the Council's proposed "preventative offer"?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</b></p> <p>The Council commissions a wide range of preventative services. The Adult Social Care department funds around £1million of community services from the voluntary sector. This includes information and advice, day opportunities and support for carers.</p> <p>As well as the funding to the voluntary sector, the reablement service and the equipment service also contribute significantly towards the preventative agenda and keeping people independent.</p> <p>The department will reinvest £100,000 of the saving, that it is expected the changes in eligibility criteria will generate, to support the development of the preventative offer. Also, the Council has identified £150,000 within the funds that will come to support social care from the NHGHS which will be directed towards the preventative offer. This, in addition to the significant existing investment, will enable us to extend the preventative offer further.</p> <p>These sums will be available to assist in ensuring that those 'not eligible for funded care support' have access to appropriate support.</p> <p>I expect to be presenting our draft Prevention Strategy to the Scrutiny Commission for Health Matters at its meeting in June.</p> <p><b>Amanda Preston asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Will the council commit to honour its consultation responses to maintain people's current preventative strategies and put more resources into preventative measures in order to stop people falling into greater levels of need?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</b></p> <p>The council is committed to the best use of its resources and will be investing in preventative work and those areas where they are most needed.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Dawn Clipston</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:</p> <p>Cllr Cereste, at the full council meeting on 5th December you gave me assurances that the remaining 2100 acres of land identified for development in July 2012 report would</p>

	<p>remain in agricultural use for the foreseeable future. As I have not yet received the written confirmation you promised could I ask for a date when I can expect to receive this confirmation?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question and my apologies for this oversight. I will ensure a letter is posted to you this week.</p> <p><b>Dawn Clipston asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>How will you be able to deliver a full energy park project if a simple letter cannot be sent for the community?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>A letter will be sent.</p>
11.	<p><b>Question from Kerrie Gracie</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services:</p> <p>What support for families and their children aged 5-12 years do you plan to put in place for all those affected by the cuts to the play service’s open access and targeted support sessions? They are located in the most disadvantaged areas of the city.</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>There are a range of services to support families with children aged 5-12, these include child care, before and after school clubs, holiday clubs, targeted support in schools and - from the local authority - direct intervention service and Connecting Families Programme. The programmes that are currently in place will assist children and families and will meet the needs of local communities.</p> <p><b>Kerrie Gracie asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>There are many other clubs for children but not all children have the support to be able to attend and therefore issues will not be picked up by care workers. How will this be addressed?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott responded:</b></p> <p>It is expected that these issues will be identified within schools and we can meet to discuss this further if required.</p>
12.	<p><b>Question from Kate Darby (absent)</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:</p> <p>The Renewable Obligation Certificates (ROCs) from government go down from 2 to 1.6 per MW on 1 April 2013. If solar panels (PVs) were on buildings, such as schools, etc you would actually receive 1.7 ROC per MW, greater than what you propose on our prime grade 1 &amp; 2 agricultural land and the occupants of those buildings would benefit. Why have you chosen not to go down this avenue?</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>ROCs are applicable to solar PV installations of 5MW and above. The power density ratio of MW generated to area required is different between a ground mounted (solar farm) and a roof mounted PV scheme. In order for the Council to qualify for ROC on a roof mounted scheme, the roof area of the building would need to be in the order of 35,000m<sup>2</sup> or 350,000ft<sup>2</sup> (approximately). The Council is considering the next phase of its roll out of solar PV on school roofs.</p>
--	--

<b>8</b>	<p><b><u>Questions with notice by Members relating to ward matters To the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen</u></b></p>
----------	---

1.	<p><b>Question from Councillor John Fox</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning:</p> <p>Will the cabinet member assure my constituents of North Werrington that the £200K allocated in this years budget for the improvement at Staniland Way roundabout, Werrington will be ring fenced for this project?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>The junction of Staniland Way with David's Lane, Werrington, has planning conditions attached in connection with the Werrington Centre redevelopment for the developers to construct a roundabout before the new development is open to the public at this location and this is part of the revised planning application received last year.</p> <p>The cabinet have committed £200k to facilitate existing junction improvements if the development is significantly delayed and hence the roundabout is not constructed by the developers but we have no reason to expect any delay.</p>
----	--

2.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Peach</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning:</p> <p>One problem that a number of residents/cyclists have is the number of cars/vehicles parked (often badly) in residents parking zones in Park Ward but also throughout the City who are not displaying a current parking permit from the Council.</p> <p>Some vehicles are left parked in the roads for long periods, sometimes days without being ticketed, others seem to know they can get away with it from evening until morning.</p> <p>This is most annoying to residents who often don't have off road parking available and pay for a permit themselves.</p> <p>The parking permits are not highly costly, in fact we stopped them being increased in last years budget when Labour voted to increase them.</p> <p>When contacting the Council I am told that they only have 12 parking enforcement officers (less than 11 as one is on long term sick leave) to deal with the whole of the unitary council area. There is also the feeling among some of our officers and many Councillors that more enforcement is needed.</p> <p>Would it be possible to fund more parking attendants either by virement of the budget</p>
----	--

	<p>from other areas within transportation or by seeking, with increased monies from issuing more enforcement tickets?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>As the city continues to grow so does the number of parking restrictions requiring enforcement, in particular there has been an increase in resident parking zones. Initiatives such as the introduction of the CCTV vehicle, early intervention to reinstate missing/damaged signs or worn road marking, and additional training for all Civil Enforcement Officers leading to a professional qualification and this has raised the overall effectiveness of the team.</p> <p>The level of staffing resource within the team is a matter that is reviewed regularly. With regards to increasing staffing numbers, providing a business case can both identify the need and funding to cover any additional costs there is no reason why the establishment could not be increased. I have asked that officers look into whether this would be possible.</p> <p><b>Councillor Peach asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member look into the possibility of greater numbers of parking zones?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, I will do this and report back.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:</p> <p>Concerning the implementation of the environment policy, how much has been spent on what by whom so far on the solar panel project on the roof at the Freeman's building in Ravensthorpe ward, what extra CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have there been created by this Council project or reduction achieved and how much income has been received by the Council?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Solar panels have also been installed on a small proportion of the roof space on the Freemans building with the potential to generate 206kW of electricity.</p> <p>However we are not yet satisfied that the installation is working as was intended and is not yet therefore revenue generating.</p> <p>Further work is underway and both parties are working together to understand the issues in order to rectify the situation as quickly as possible.</p> <p>To date, the city council has spent in the region of a third of the projected cost, £300,000 of the total invoiced amount of £946,684.</p> <p>The council is taking steps to ensure that taxpayers' money already spent on the project is protected.</p> <p>The council will be updated in relation to the current negotiations in due course.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</b></p>

	<p>How much has been spent in total by all partners and on what aspects of the project as no income has yet been generated?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>The council has spent £300,000 and no more will be spent until the issue has been resolved. Any investments of this kind are protected. Approximately 20 other installations are already up and running as expected.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ash</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning:</p> <p>Some years ago grasscrete was installed in the Dogsthorpe area as a means of providing parking spaces on verges without damaging the grass or surface but motorists have now been fined for parking on grasscrete in Dogsthorpe.</p> <p>I note that it has been suggested in the recent mid term financial report to cabinet that grasscrete might be used in other wards and if this is the case would it then mean there will be inconsistencies in policy that would lead to confusion which need to be clarified and does the cabinet member now believe that grasscrete is suitable for parking and that fines for parking on this surface should not have previously been issued?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>The installation of Grass-crete in parts of Dogsthorpe dates back to at least the year 2000, and was done to limit the damage caused by verge parking at some locations. With verge parking remaining a significant problem in the area, and following public consultation, a Traffic Order was implemented in 2006 prohibiting parking on all verges. Since 2006 any vehicle parked on the verge contravenes the order and consequently can legitimately be issued with a Penalty Charge Notice.</p> <p>The use of Grass-crete in other wards does not create inconsistencies in policy; the appropriate solution to manage verge parking will vary from location to location, and will also include on occasions measures such as the planting of trees and shrubs. There is no order to ban verge parking at the locations identified within the Mid Term Financial Strategy for Grass-crete, therefore there are no similarities with the Dogsthorpe area.</p> <p><b>Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member agree that if parking on grasscrete verges is allowed in one area and not in another that this could cause confusion for residents when parking?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, this could be perceived as confusing. It may be a case of needing better signage but this could be raised with officers to resolve this issue.</p>
9	<p><b><u>Questions with notice by Members to Council representatives of the Fire Authority</u></b></p>
	<p><b>None received.</b></p>

**EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME**

**10 Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive**

**1. Question from Councillor John Fox**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources:

Given that the City Council has previously sponsored Peterborough United Football matches, can the Cabinet Member advise me whether Peterborough United has paid in full their rent/rates for the football ground and if not what plans are in force to recover this money as soon as possible?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

We are in negotiation with Peterborough United Football Club Limited about a new long-term lease and the financial arrangements around this. Considerations include the length of lease, new rental arrangements, a mechanism to allow the tenant to acquire the freehold interest during the new lease term and any rent abatement during the redevelopment works to reflect loss of income. The status of these discussions is at this stage commercially confidential. These negotiations also cover agreement on rent arrears and a payment plan is in place to manage these.

**Councillor Fox asked the following supplementary question:**

How much money is owed and how many football matches are sponsored by the council and at what cost?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

There is an agreement in place on rent arrears. The council has spent around £8,000 on match sponsorship this year including £4,000 for the Birmingham game that included hosting representatives from the disabled sports initiative 'Inspire'.

**2. Question from Councillor Peach (taken as read)**

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council:

I'm sure that many residents welcome the improvement works currently being carried out in Bridge Street and Cowgate. The new paving and better lighting (particular the nice blue lights focusing on the trees) give a much better feel to the area.

I know that some years ago when these works were originally planned it was envisaged that works would carry on down Long Causeway and indeed the town end of Broadway with trees in the middle of Broadway as in the original plans when the road was first laid over a hundred years ago.

Are these works part of the now current scheme of works? If not can they be looked at in a later scheme?

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

Thank you for your question. Like you I believe that the works in both Bridge Street and

Cowgate are essential in taking forward the City Centre.

The new condition of the square and occupation of shop units has attracted national attention. When Bridge Street is complete we will extend the scheme to Long Causeway and subject to financing will look to include Broadway and Midgate.

**Councillor Peach asked the following supplementary question:**

Does the Leader agree that there should not be too much delay between the proposed schemes?

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

Yes, I agree.